REMARKS

Claims 11-22 are pending in the application; the status of the claims is as follows:

Claims 11, 14, 16, 19, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,151,067 to Suemoto et al ("Suemoto et al").

Claims 12, 13, 15, 17, 18, 20, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suemoto et al.

Claims 11 and 16 have been amended. These changes do not introduce any new matter.

35 U.S.C. § 102(e) Rejection

The rejection of claims 11, 14, 16, 19, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Suemoto et al, is respectfully traversed based on the following.

According to Suemoto, camera body 10 is provided with multi-connector 11 to which an accessory such as AV connector 92 or liquid crystal monitor 300 may be connected. Each accessory is provided with a unique combination of identification signals (S0, S1, and S2), so that the input and output states and operation of the camera may be changed according to the combination of signals actually provided by a connected accessory. However, Suemoto allows a case in which connecting an accessory evokes no change whatsoever in the operation of the camera body 10. For example, Table 1 shows that operation of camera body 10 is the same when the AV connector is connected as when there are no accessories connected.

In contradistinction, the present claims require that the connection of **any** accessory results in a change in the operation of the camera. For example, amended claim 11 recites "transitioning the camera into a state in order to output image data

through said connector and said connection device when said detector detects that said connection device is attached to said connector." Analogously, claim 16 recites "when said detector detects that said connection device is attached to said connector, the camera system is transitioned into a state in order to output stored image data to the external apparatus." As noted above, the device taught by Suemoto does not transition to another state when the AV connector is connected (see Table 1). Therefore, claims 11 and 16 distinguish over Suemoto.

Claims 14 depends from claim 11, whereas 19 and 21 depend from claim 16. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that these claims distinguish over Suemoto for at least the same resons as their respective parent claims.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 11, 14, 16, 19, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Suemoto et al, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejection

The rejection of claims 12, 13, 15, 17, 18, 20, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Suemoto et al, is respectfully traversed based on the following.

Claims 12, 13, 15 depend from claim 11, and claims 17, 18, 20, and 22 depend from claim 16. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 12, 13, 15, 17, 18, 20, and 22 distinguish over Suemoto for at least the same reasons as their respective parent claims.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 12, 13, 15, 17, 18, 20, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suemoto et al, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Application No. 09/047,676 Amendment dated December 16, 2004

Reply to Office Action of June 17, 2004

Wherefore, in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application is

considered to be in condition for allowance, and an early reconsideration and a Notice of

Allowance are earnestly solicited.

This Amendment does not increase the number of independent claims, does not

increase the total number of claims, and does not present any multiple dependency claims.

Accordingly, no fee based on the number or type of claims is currently due. However, if a

fee, other than the issue fee, is due, please charge this fee to Sidley Austin Brown & Wood

LLP's Deposit Account No. 18-1260.

If an extension of time is required to enable this document to be timely filed and

there is no separate Petition for Extension of Time filed herewith, this document is to be

construed as also constituting a Petition for Extension of Time Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)

for a period of time sufficient to enable this document to be timely filed.

Any other fee required for such Petition for Extension of Time and any other fee

required by this document pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17, other than the issue fee,

and not submitted herewith should be charged to Sidley Austin Brown & Wood LLP's

Deposit Account No. 18-1260. Any refund should be credited to the same account.

Respectfully submitted,

Itichael J. DeHaemer

Registration No. 39,164

Attorney for Applicants

MJD/llb:bar

SIDLEY AUSTIN BROWN & WOOD LLP

717 N. Harwood, Suite 3400

Dallas, Texas 75201

Direct:

(214) 981-3335

Main:

(214) 981-3300

Facsimile: (214) 981-3400

December 16, 2004

- 8 -